

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 20 - Issue 8

August 2014

## How Global Policy Becomes Local

By Tom DeWeese

*I first issued the following article in 2005. Since that time, planning groups like the American Planning Association and other Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are involved in implementing sustainable development across the nation, vigorously deny that their programs have anything to do with the United Nations or Agenda 21. And they have gone on the attack through a variety of hit pieces and articles in major news magazines to label those of us fighting Agenda 21 as just kooky conspiracy theorists. Their main argument is that Agenda 21 is a “soft law” policy that has no enforcement capability. “It’s just voluntary,” they insist over and over again. “There are no blue helmeted troops at city hall,” they sarcastically proclaim. But who needs UN troops when they have the NGO shock troops? The following article clearly shows how they target and enlist local mayors to “voluntarily” thrust their agenda on the hapless, voiceless citizens of their communities. Of course, once the mayors “voluntarily” signed these agreements, the NGO storm troopers were there to assure they kept their promise. This is how it’s done. TAD*

In June 2005, the city of San Francisco was the site of an international conference called “World Environment Day.” But the agenda of this conference was much bigger than just another “hippy dance” in the park. This meeting of the global elite had a specific target and an agenda with teeth. The goal was the full implementation of the U.N.’s Agenda 21 policy and Sustainable Development. This time, the target audience was our nation’s mayors. The U.N.’s new tactics on full display at this conference is to ignore federal and state governments and go straight to the roots of American society. Think globally – act locally.

As part of their participation in the conference, mayors were pressed to commit their communities to specific legislative and policy goals by signing a slate of United Nations accords. Two documents were presented for the mayors’ signatures.

The first document was called the “Green Cities Declaration,” a statement of principles which set the agenda for the mayors’ assigned task. It says, in part, “Believing as Mayors of cities around the globe, we have a unique opportunity to provide leadership to develop truly sustainable urban centers based on culturally and economically appropriate local actions...” The Declaration was amazingly bold in that

it details exactly how the U.N. intends to implement a very specific agenda in every town and city in the nation. The document includes lots of rhetoric about the need to curtail greenhouse gases and preserve resources. But the final line of the Green Cities Declaration was the point of the whole affair: “Signatory cities shall work to implement the following Urban Environment Accords. Each year cities shall pick three actions to adopt as policies or laws.”

The raw meat of the agenda was outlined in detail in the second document, called the “Urban Environment Accords.” The Accords include exactly 21 specific actions (as in Agenda 21) for the mayors to take, controlled by a timetable for implementation.

Here’s a quick look at a few of the 21 agenda actions called for. Under the topic of energy, action item number one calls for mayors to implement a policy to increase the use of “renewable” energy by 10% within seven years. Renewable energy includes solar and wind power.

Not stated in the U.N. documents is the fact that in order to meet the goal, a community would have to reserve thousands of acres of land to set up expensive solar panels or even more land for windmills. Consider

that it takes a current 50 megawatt gas-fired generating plant about 2-5 acres of land to produce its power. To create that same amount of power through the use of solar panels would require at least 1,000 acres. Using windmills to generate 50 megawatts would require over 4,000 acres of land, while chopping up birds and creating a deafening roar. The cost of such “alternative” energy to the community would be vastly prohibitive. Yet, such unworkable ideas are the environmentally-correct orders of the days that the mayors were being urged to follow.

Energy Actions two and three deal with the issue of reducing energy consumption. Both of these are back-door sneak attacks by the U.N. to enforce the discredited Kyoto Global Warming Treaty, which President Bush refused to implement. Kyoto would force the United States to reduce its energy consumption by at least 30 percent, forcing energy shortages and severely damaging the nation’s economy. Kyoto is the centerpiece of the U.N.’s drive to control the world economy and redistribute wealth to Third World nations. It would do nothing to help the environment. Yet, the mayors are being pushed to help implement this destructive treaty city-by-city.

Perhaps the most egregious action offered in the Urban Environmental Accords deals with the topic of water. Action #Twenty calls for adoption and implementation of a policy to reduce individual water consumption by 10% by 2020. Interestingly, the U.N. begins by stating: “Cities with potable water consumption greater than 100 liters per capita per day will adopt and implement policies to reduce consumption by 10 percent by 2015.”

One must be aware that 100 liters equals about 26 gallons per person, per day. According to the U.N., each person should only have 10% less than 26 gallons each day to drink, bathe, flush toilets, wash clothes, water lawns, wash dishes, cook, and more.

However, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, Americans need about 100 GALLONS per day to perform these basic functions. The use of the 100 LITERS vs 100 GALLONS is a direct attempt to mislead and actually cut water consumption by 75%.

Consider also that there is no specific water shortage in the United States. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, annual water withdrawal across the nation is about 407 billion gallons, while consumption (including evaporation and plant use, is about 94 billion gallons. Such restrictions, as outlined in the Urban Environment Accords, are really nothing more than a major campaign by the U.N. to control water consumption. Yet, the nation’s mayors are being pushed to impose policies to take away our free use of water. Water is not an international issue – but a very local one.

The rest of the Accords deal with a variety of subjects including waste reduction, recycling, transportation, health, and nature. Perhaps the most blatant promise of action is Action number sixteen in which the mayors are supposed to agree to “Every year identify three products, chemicals, or compounds that are used within your city that represents the greatest risk to human health and adopt a law to eliminate their sale and use in the city.”

There you have it. Every year, our nation’s mayors are to promise to ban something! What if there isn’t a “chemical or compound” that poses a risk? Gotta ban something anyway. That’s not an idle threat. In the 1990’s Anchorage, Alaska had some of the most pristine water in the nation. It had no pollution. Yet, the Federal Government ordered the city to meet strict federal clean water standards that required it to remove a certain percentage of pollution. In order to meet those requirements, Anchorage was forced to dump fish parts into its pristine water so that it could then clean out the required quotas. Your city’s mayor may have to ban the ink in your fountain pen to meet his quota – and ban it he will.

And what is the mayor’s reward for destroying private property rights, increasing energy costs on less consumption, and banning something useful every year? He gets green stars. That’s right. According to U.N. documents, if your mayor can complete 8-11 of the prescribed 21 actions, the town will get a green star and the designation, “Local Sustainable City.” 12-17 actions completed will garner two green stars and the designation, “National Sustainable City.”

## DeWeese Report

Vol. 20, No. 8  
August 2014

Published by  
The American Policy  
Center

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/  
Fulfillment  
Lola Jane Craig  
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout  
CJ Scrofani  
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report  
PO Box 129  
Remington, VA  
22734

Web Page:  
[www.deweese-report.com](http://www.deweese-report.com)

Copy Right 2014  
The American Policy  
Center  
Issn 1086-7937  
All Rights Reserved

Permission to photocopy,  
Reprint and quote articles  
from the DeWeese Report  
is

hereby granted, provided  
full acknowledgment is  
included. All reprinted  
articles must say:

“Written  
by Tom DeWeese, Editor  
of DeWeese Report  
(unless

another author is listed).  
All reprints must carry the  
DeWeese Report address  
and phone number.

Samples of the reprint  
must be provided to the  
DeWeese Report

15-18 actions completed will bring in three green stars and the title “Regional Sustainable City.” Finally, the energizer bunny mayor who gets 19-21 actions completed will get a full four green stars and the ultimate designation of “Global Sustainable City.” Certainly he or she will also get a plaque and get to sit at the head table at the next U.N. Sustainable Development conference.

In the San Francisco summit, the mayors were wooed by the elite, from U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, to Maurice Strong, to Senator Diane Feinstein, to Hollywood activists Robert Redford and Martin Sheen, to Chimp master Jane Goodall. All the usual suspects were there to press the flesh and push the agenda. Businesses like Mitsubishi, which hopes to make huge profits from green industry with its government subsidies and taxpayer grants, helped pay for the event. The news media was well represented too, not in a journalistic role to report the news, but as full-fledged sponsors helping to spread their own brand of propaganda. All understood that a new governing elite, elected by no one, answerable to their own set of standards, is being created for the care and feeding of us all. With the right contacts and the proper show of public spirit, there are riches and power to be created. Even for your local mayor.

Sustainable Development is truly stunning in its magnitude to transform the world into feudal-like governance by making nature the central organizing principle for our economy and society. It is a scheme fueled by unsound science and discredited economics that can only lead modern society down the road to a new

Dark Age. It is a policy of banning goods and regulating and controlling human action. It is systematically implemented through the creation of non-elected visioning boards and planning commissions. There is no place in the Sustainable world for individual thought, private property or free enterprise. It is the exact opposite of the free society envisioned by this nation’s founders.

Even before the San Francisco conference, the U.N.’s influence over the nation’s mayors had been felt as 132 U.S. mayors moved to implement the Kyoto Treaty in defiance of the Bush Administration’s rejection of it. Moreover, the treaty was the centerpiece of the agenda for the national meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, slated for Chicago just one week after the San Francisco meeting. Think globally and act locally is no longer just a slogan on the back of a Volvo. It’s a well-entrenched national policy bleeding down into your local community, carried there by Judas goats who have been elected by you.

America’s mayors are the elected representatives closest to the people. They are the ones that our founders intended to have the most influence over our daily lives. If the U.N. succeeds in its efforts to enforce Sustainable Development policy through our mayors, the process will accelerate at an astounding rate and locally-controlled government will cease to exist. But signs, adorned with green stars, will certainly greet us at every city limit line as the inhabitants, stripped of their property rights; buried under huge tax burdens; struggling under reduced energy flow, shuffle on as their proud mayor gleams in the global limelight under the banner “think globally and act locally.” ●

## Attack of the NGOs

*And who are these NGO shock troops and how do they operate? It’s a vast matrix composed of both the private NGO groups and representatives of the UN and representatives of a large number of US federal agencies – all working together behind the scenes, quietly making policy for the rest of us. And when I attempt to expose them, the vehemently deny there is any collusion – “pay no attention to that man behind the curtain.” Sorry, the truth is – this is how it works. No vote. No public input. Just the enforcement of an agenda through the willing participation of private groups and government officials who forgot their purpose was to represent, not dictate to us. The NGOs are the storm troopers necessary to make it all happen. The article below was first published in 2008, has been included in the American Policy Center’s “Stop Agenda 21 Action Kit,” and most currently the subject of one of APC’s monthly stop Agenda 21 instructional webinars – available in the webinar archives on the APC website, [www.americanpolicy.org](http://www.americanpolicy.org). TAD*

By Tom DeWeese

One rarely hears of it. Few elected officials raise an eyebrow. The media makes no mention of it. But power is slowly slipping away from our elected representatives. In much the same way Mao Tse tung had his Red Guards, so the UN has its NGOs. They may well be your masters of tomorrow, and you don’t even know who or what they are.

There are, in fact, two parallel, complimentary forces at work in the world, working together to advance the global Sustainable Development agenda, ultimately leading toward UN global governance. Those two forces are the UN itself and non-governmental organizations (NGOs.)

Beginning with the United Nations, the infrastructure pushing the Sustainable Development agenda is a vast, international matrix. At the top of the heap is the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP).

Created in 1973 by the UN General Assembly, the UNEP is the catalyst through which the global environmental agenda is implemented. Virtually all of the international environmental programs and policy changes that have occurred globally in the past three decades are the result of UNEP efforts.

But the UNEP doesn't operate on its own. Influencing it and helping to write policy are thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These are private groups which seek to implement a specific political agenda. Through the UN infrastructure, particularly through the UNEP, they have great power.

The phrase "non-governmental organization" came into use with the establishment of the United Nations Organization in 1945 with provisions in Article 71 of Chapter 10 of the United Nations Charter. The term describes a consultative role for organizations that are neither government nor member states of the UN.

NGOs are not just any private group hoping to influence policy. True NGOs are officially sanctioned by the United Nations. Such status was created by UN Resolution 1296 in 1948, giving NGOs official "Consultative" status to the UN. That means they can not only sit in on international meetings, but can actively participate in creating policy, right along side government representatives.

There are numerous classifications of NGO's. The two most common are "Operational" and "Advocacy." Operational NGOs are involved with designing and implementing specific projects such as feeding the hungry or organizing relief projects. These groups can be religious or secular. They can be community-based, national or international. The International Red Cross falls under the category of an operational NGO.

Advocacy NGOs are promoting a specific political agenda. They lobby government bodies, use the news media and organize activist-oriented events, all designed to raise awareness and apply pressure to promote their causes which include environmental issues, human rights, poverty, education, children, drinking water, and population control - to name a few. Amnesty International is the largest human rights advocacy NGO in the world. Organized globally, it has more than 1.8

million members, supporters and subscribers in over 150 countries.

Today these NGOs have power nearly equal to member nations when it comes to writing U.N. policy. Just as civil service bureaucrats provide the infrastructure for government operation, so to do NGOs provide such infrastructure for the U.N. In fact, most U.N. policy is first debated and then written by the NGOs and presented to national government officials at international meetings for approval and ratification. It is through this process that the individual political agendas of the NGO groups enter the international political arena.

The policies sometimes come in the form of international treaties or simply as policy guidelines. Once the documents are presented to and accepted by representatives of member states and world leaders, obscure political agendas of private organizations suddenly become international policy, and are then adopted as national and local laws by U.N. member states. Through this very system, Sustainable Development has grown from a collection of ideas and wish lists of a wide variety of private organizations to become the most widely implemented tool in the U.N.'s quest for global governance.

The three most powerful organizations influencing UNEP policy are three international NGOs. They are the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), the World Resources Institute (WRI) and the International Union for Conservation and Nature (IUCN). These three groups provide the philosophy, objectives and methodology for the international environmental agenda through a series of official reports and studies such as: World Conservation Strategy, published in 1980 by all three groups; Global Biodiversity Strategy, published in 1992; and Global Biodiversity Assessment, published in 1996.

These groups not only influence UNEP's agenda, they also influence a staggering array of international and national NGOs around the world. Jay Hair, former head of the National Wildlife Federation, one of the U.S.'s largest environmental organizations, was also the president of the IUCN. Hair later turned up as co-chairman of the Presidents Council on Sustainable Development.

The WWF maintains a network of national chapters around the world, which influence, if not dominate, NGO activities at the national level. It is at the national level where NGOs agitate and lobby national governments to implement the policies that the IUCN, WWF and WRI get written into the documents that are advanced by the UNEP. In this manner, the world grows ever closer to global governance.

Other than treaties, how does UNEP policy become U.S. policy? Specifically, the IUCN has an incredible mix of U.S. government agencies along with major U.S. NGOs as members. Federal agencies include the Department of State, Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the National Park Service (NPS) the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the Fish and Wildlife service. These agencies send representatives to all meetings of the UNEP.

Also attending those meetings as active members are NGO representatives. These include activist groups such as the Environmental Defense Fund, National Audubon Society, The Nature Conservancy, National Wildlife Federation, Zero Population growth, Planned Parenthood, the Sierra Club, the National Education Association, and hundreds more. These groups all have specific political agendas they desire to become law. Through their official contact with government agencies working side-by-side with the UNEP, their political wish lists become official government policy.

How can this be, you ask? How can private organizations control policy and share equal power to elected officials? Here's how it works.

When the dust settled over the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, five major documents were forced into international policy that will change forever how national policy is made. More importantly, the Rio Summit produced the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). UNCED outlined a new procedure for shaping policy. The procedure has no name, nor is it dictatorial. It is perhaps best described as "controlled consensus" or "affirmative acquiescence."

Put in simple street language, the procedure really amounts to a collection of NGOs, bureaucrats and government officials, all working together toward a predetermined outcome. They have met together in meetings, written policy statements based on international agreements, which they helped to create and now they are about to impose laws and regulations that will have dire effects on people's lives and national economies. Yet, with barely a twinge of conscience they move forward with the policy, saying nothing. No one objects. It's understood. Everyone goes along. For this is a barbaric procedure that insures their desired outcome without the ugliness of bloodshed, or even debate. It is the procedure used to advance the radical, global environmental agenda.

The UNCED procedure utilizes four elements of power: international government (UN); national governments; non-governmental organizations, and

philanthropic institutions.

The NGOs are the key to the process. They create policy ideas from their own private agendas. The policy idea is then adopted by one or more U.N. organizations for consideration at a regional conference. Each conference is preceded by an NGO forum designed specifically to bring NGO activists into the debate. There they are fully briefed on the policy and then trained to prepare papers and lobby and influence the official delegates of the conference. In this way, the NGOs control the debate and assure the policy is adopted.

The ultimate goal of the conference is to produce a "Convention," which is a legally- drawn policy statement on specific issues. Once the "Convention" is adopted by the delegates, it is sent to the national governments for official ratification. Once that is done, the new policy becomes international law.

Then the real work begins. Compliance must be assured. Again, the NGOs come into the picture. They are responsible for pressuring Congress to write national laws in order to comply with the treaty. One trick used to assure compliance is to write into the laws the concept of third-party lawsuits.

NGOs now regularly sue the government and private citizens to force policy. They have their legal fees and even damage awards paid to them out of the government treasury. Through a coordinated process, hundreds of NGOs are at work in Congress, in every state government and in every local community, advancing some component of the global environmental agenda.

However, the United States Constitution's Tenth Amendment bars the Federal Government from writing laws that dictate local policy. To by pass this roadblock, NGOs encourage Congress to include special grants to help states and communities to fund the new policy, should they want to "voluntarily" comply.

Should a community or state refuse to participate "voluntarily," local chapters of the NGOs are trained to go into action. They begin to pressure city councils or county commissioners to accept the grants and implement the policy. Should they meet resistance, they begin to issue news releases telling the community their elected officials are losing millions of dollars for the community. The pressure continues until the grant is finally taken and the policy becomes local law. This practice has resulted in the NGOs gaining incredible power on the local level. Today, a great number of communities are actually run by NGO members as city and county governments are staffed by

NGO members. They serve on local unelected boards and regional councils that the NGOs helped to create. Local representative government is slowly relinquishing its power to the NGOs.

Americans must begin to understand that the debate

over environmental issues have very little to do with clean water and air and much more to do with the establishment of power. NGOs are gaining it, locally elected officials are losing it as the structure of American government changes to accommodate the private agendas of NGOs. ●

## Beware of False Prophets

By Charles Battig, M.D.

Positive public perception of the scientist has long been powerful. The public has the tendency to defer to scientists, as it does to authority in general. It is part of the educational and socialization process inherent in societies.

Scientists are in a special category in the public's mind, since they are perceived to have specialized knowledge that, it is assumed, will benefit society in general and, more importantly, the individual concerned with his own well-being.

Scientists are assumed to be the link between the mysteries of our natural world and the means to better our chances of survival in it. They are assumed to be impartial in seeking fact, as best as it can be determined or approximated. From the time of the alchemists to the present, that assumption continues.

Idealism in such scientific pursuits has had a tough time in the real world. When the scientist has convinced himself in the discovery of a new law of nature, his ability to communicate its veracity to the public is equally challenging, and often proves life-threatening. The established order (read: special interests) has been equally ingenious in using its view of the world to its financial and political ends. The ruling classes of all types are highly protective of their means of controlling the public.

When the age of enlightenment produced such an outpouring of new scientific discoveries seeming to hold benefits for all strata of society, the scientist achieved the respectability not afforded the primitive alchemist. Karl Popper and then Richard Feynman provided the moral underpinnings of what should be the measure of truth in the scientific method.

At each step, the political classes were equally busy looking to bend the curve of new knowledge to their advantage. As dispensers of favors, fame, and funds, they can make tempting offers to those who might see reality their preferred way. In place of Feynman has come post-normal science, a sort of à-la-carte pseudo-scientific expediency in place of old-fashioned "falsifiability."

Once a relatively obscure field of scientific interest, climatology has become front-page news, and a battleground of competing claims of theory and verifiable knowledge. The origins of this transition have been speculated upon and include post-WWII groups as the Bilderbergs, and more formally the Club of Rome. Population growth, environmental idealism, and new-age earth worship were part of the mix. Intoned guilt over societal progress in bettering bare existence became a new meme for the promoters of societal control.

Energy, increasingly abundant and cheap, literally powered this growing and more prosperous society. Parts of the world benefited unevenly in such growth, but even in the "disadvantaged" parts, energy held promise to better meager existence. The population control activists feared the consequences of such growth in both the developed and undeveloped world. They sought a common enemy, and defined it as mankind. Then they defined man-made carbon dioxide as the global scapegoat.

The recent publication of the latest National Climate Assessment Report, and the EPA proposed rule on carbon dioxide emissions by power plants, can be seen as coordinated assaults on affordable energy in the U.S. The inherent scientific contradictions within these documents and their advocacy in place of impartial scientific argument have been documented by others. The public is left confused and at the mercies of inadequate media reporting, itself a source of one-sided advocacy commentary.

Political wordsmiths have coined the term "carbon pollution." By stringing together two scientifically unrelated words, they have crafted an emotionally charged term to fit the needs of government and propagandists. We are categorized as "carbon-based life forms." Carbon dioxide is an inherent and necessary chemical component of all such life. Photosynthesis and the role of carbon dioxide describe the dance of nature by which the carbon dioxide produced by our bodies is part of the atmospheric carbon dioxide that feeds the plants, which in turn produce the oxygen we need to live.

The negative connotation of pollution has been grafted onto carbon in a version of Gresham's Law – the bad driving out the good. This is not science, but propaganda.

Having defined a new hazard in the minds of public, the government has now assumed the mantle of protector and can prophesize that the new clean air regulations specifically targeting carbon dioxide (“carbon pollution”) will prevent “150,000 asthma attacks in children each year and 20,000 heart attacks,” forestall dangerous climate change, hold back sea-level rise, and prevent global warming. The lack of valid supporting scientific facts to make such claims is ignored, as political dogma has marginalized and even punished scientific dissent.

Federally mandated cures for nonexistent carbon pollution will inflict real health harm as the less advantaged are forced to pay more for basic energy

needs. More expensive heating and cooling bills will be added to more expensive basic food as farmland is used to grow fuel stock produce. More expensive gasoline will hinder trips to the doctor. More expensive transportation and manufacturing processes will increase the cost of living for all and lower the standard of living for many. Bad science kills.

The false prophets have spoken. The admonition “beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves” is fair warning.

*Charles Battig, M.D. is Piedmont Chapter president, VA-Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment (VA-SEEE). His website is [www.climateis.com](http://www.climateis.com). Dr. Battig is a support of the American Policy Center and his article first appeared in the American Thinker.* ●

## Executive fiats in the other Washington

### Two western state governors intend to get low carbon fuel standards, by legislation or decree

By Paul Driessen

Progressives believe in free speech, robust debate, sound science and economics, transparency, government by the people and especially compassion for the poor – except when they don't. These days, their commitment to these principles seems to be at low ebb ... in both Washingtons.

A perfect example is the Oregon and Washington governors' determined effort to enact Low Carbon Fuel Standards – via deceptive tax-funded campaigns, tilted legislative processes and executive fiat.

The standards require that conventional vehicle fuels be blended with alternative manmade fuels said to have less carbon in their chemical makeup or across the life cycle of creating and using the fuels. They comport with political viewpoints that oppose hydrocarbon use, prefer mass transit, are enchanted by the idea of growing fuels instead of drilling and fracking for them, and/or are convinced that even slightly reduced carbon dioxide will help reduce or prevent “dangerous manmade climate change.”

LCFS fuels include ethanol, biodiesel and still essentially nonexistent cellulosic biofuels, but the concept of lower carbon and CO2 naturally extends to boosting the number of electric and hybrid vehicles.

Putting aside the swirling controversies over natural versus manmade climate change, its dangers to humans and wildlife, the phony [97% consensus](#), and the failure of [climate models](#) – addressed in [Climate Change Reconsidered](#) and at the Heartland Institute's [Climate](#)

[Conference](#) – the LCFS agenda itself is highly contentious, for economic, technological, environmental and especially political reasons.

California has long led the nation on climate and “green” energy initiatives, spending billions on subsidies, while [relying heavily](#) on other states for its energy needs. The programs have sent the cost of energy steadily upward, driven thousands of families and businesses out of the state, and made it the fourth worst jobless state in America. Governors Jerry Brown, John Kitzhaber and Jay Inslee (of California, Oregon and Washington, respectively) recently joined British Columbia Premier Christy Clark in signing an agreement that had been developed behind closed doors, to coordinate policies on climate change, low carbon fuel standards and greenhouse gas emission limits throughout the region.

California and BC have already implemented LCFS and other rules. Oregon has LCFS, but its law terminates the program at the end of 2015, unless the legislature extends it. As that seems unlikely, Mr. Kitzhaber has promised that he will use an executive order to impose an extension and “fully implement” the state's Clean Fuels Program. “We have the opportunity to spark a homegrown clean fuels industry,” the governor said, and he is determined to use “every tool at my disposal” to make that happen. He is convinced it will create jobs, though experience elsewhere suggests the opposite is much more likely.

Mr. Inslee is equally committed to implementing a climate agenda, LCFS and “carbon market.” If the legislature won’t support his plans, he will use his executive authority, a state-wide ballot initiative or campaigns against recalcitrant legislators – utilizing support from coal and hedge fund billionaire Tom Steyer. Indeed, Inslee attended a closed-door fundraiser in Steyer’s home the very day he signed the climate agreement. The governor says he won’t proceed until a “rigorous analysis” of LCFS costs and technologies has been conducted, but he plans to sole-source that task to a liberal California company.

Their ultimate goal is simple. As Mother Jones magazine put it, “if Washington acts strongly on climate, the impact will extend far beyond Washington.... The more these Pacific coast states are unified, the more the United States and even the world will have to take notice.”

But to what end? In a world that is surging ahead economically, to lift billions out of abject poverty and disease – with over 80% of the energy provided by coal, oil and natural gas – few countries (or states) are likely to follow. They would be crazy to do so. Supposed environmental and climate benefits will therefore be few, whereas damage to economies, families and habitats will be extensive.

The Oregonian says the LCFS is “ultimately a complicated way of forcing people who use conventional fuels to subsidize those who use low-carbon fuels. It’s a hidden tax to support ‘green’ transportation. It will raise fuel prices ... create a costly compliance burden ... [and] harm Oregon’s competitiveness far more than it will help the environment. And that assumes it works as intended.” It will not and cannot.

LCFS laws will raise the cost of motor fuels by up to 170% over the next ten years – on top of all the other price hikes like minimum wages and the \$1.86 trillion in total annual federal (only) regulatory compliance costs that businesses and families already have to pay – the Charles River Associates economic forecasting firm calculates. If these LCFS standards were applied nationally, CRA concluded, they would also destroy between 2.5 million and 4.5 million American jobs.

Ethanol gets 30% less mileage than gasoline, so motorists pay the same price per tank but can drive fewer miles. It collects water, clogs fuel lines, corrodes engine parts, and wreaks havoc on lawn mowers and other small engines. E15 fuel blends (15% ethanol) exacerbate these problems, and low-carbon mandates (“goals”) would likely require 20% ethanol and biodiesel blends, trucking and other groups point out.

Those blends would void vehicle engine warranties and cause extensive damages and repair costs. The higher fuel costs would affect small business expansion, hiring, profitability and survival. The impact of lost jobs, repair costs, and soaring food and fuel bills will hit poor and minority families especially hard.

Some farmers make a lot of money off ethanol. However, beef, pork, chicken, egg and fish producers must pay more for feed, which means family food bills go up. Biofuel mandates also mean international aid agencies must pay more for corn and wheat, so more starving people remain malnourished longer.

Biofuels harm the environment. America has at least a century of petroleum right under our feet, right here in the United States, but “renewable” energy advocates don’t want us to lease, drill, frack or use that energy. However, the per-acre energy from biofuels is minuscule compared to what we get from oil and gas production. In fact, to grow corn for ethanol, we are already plowing an area bigger than Iowa – millions of acres that could be food crops or wildlife habitat. To meet the latest biodiesel mandate of 1.3 billion gallons, producers will have to extract oil from 430 million bushels of soybeans – which means converting countless more acres from food or habitat to energy.

Producing biofuels also requires massive quantities of pesticides, fertilizers, fossil fuels – and water. The US Department of Energy calculates that fracking requires 0.6 to 6.0 gallons of fresh or brackish water per million Btu of energy produced. By comparison, corn-based ethanol requires 2,500 to 29,000 gallons of fresh water per million Btu of energy – and biodiesel from soybeans consumes an astounding and unsustainable 14,000 to 75,000 gallons of fresh water per million Btu!

Moreover, biofuels bring no net “carbon” benefits. In terms of carbon molecules consumed and carbon dioxide emitted over the entire planting, growing, harvesting, refining, shipping and fuel use cycle, ethanol, biodiesel and other “green” fuels are no better than conventional gasoline and diesel.

Put bluntly, giving politicians, bureaucrats and eco-activists power over our energy would be even worse than having them run our healthcare system and insurance websites. Spend enough billions (much of it taxpayer money) on subsidies and propaganda campaigns – and you might convince a lot of people they should pay more at the pump and grocery store, and maybe lose their jobs, for illusory environmental benefits. But low-carbon mandates are a horrid idea that must be scrutinized in open, robust debate.

It’s time we stopped letting ideology trump science, economics and sanity. We certainly cannot afford to let despotic presidents and governors continue using executive orders to trample on our legislative processes, government by the people, constitutions, laws, freedoms, livelihoods and living standards.

Fiats are fun cars to drive. Executive fiats are dictatorial paths to bad public policy.

*Paul driessen is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow ([www.CFACT.org](http://www.CFACT.org)) and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death. ●*